DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 014 TM 002 826

AUTHOR Norton, Daniel P.
TITLE Governors State University Needs Assessment Survey.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Evanston, Ill.
PUB DATE Apr 70
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Public Opinion; Questionnaires; *Surveys; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

An opinion survey was conducted of individuals in government, education, business, industry, and the arts, from the local to the national level, prior to formalizing the operational objectives of Governors State University, a new senior university. The survey employed a Delphi-like procedure to acquire the opinions of respondents with regard to the institutional characteristics to be sought for the developing university. The first mailing was directed to 1,185 individuals or key positions. Their responses to the broad, open-ended questions were used to construct the second questionnaire, which was mailed to 1,205 names. The 547 usable responses to the second questionnaire constitute the basic data used to prepare most of this report. Analyses were made by item and response group. (Author/KM)

ED 078014

TM 002 826

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Daniel P. Horton

April 1970

Educational Testing Service
Midwestern Office
Evanston, Illinois

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	1
DESIGN OF THE SURVEY	2
INSTRUMENTATION	4
THE POPULATION OF RESPONDENTS	6
Percents of Responses by Sort Group Categories	8
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES	10
Summed Rank of Sort Groups	11
RECOMMENDATIONS	14
APPENDIX A: Questionnaire "A" and Accompanying Cover Letter for the First Governors State University Needs Assessment Survey	27
APPENDIX B: Questionnaire "B" and Accompanying Cover Letter for the Second (Final) Governors State University Needs Assessment Survey	32
APPENDIX C: Percents of Responses to the Mailing of Questionnaire "B" Arranged by Source or Name of Office	38

TABLES

I.-XI. Item Sets of Questionnaire "B"	15-25
XII. Rank Order and Means of Items on Questionnaire "B"	26
XIII. Percents of Responses to the Mailing of Questionnaire "B" Arranged by Source or Name of Office	39-40

ABSTRACT

An opinion survey was conducted by Educational Testing Service for Governors State University, a new senior university being built in Park Forest, Illinois. Prior to formalizing its operational objectives, Governors State University wished to incorporate in its planning the thinking of a variety of individuals from many walks of life.

Accordingly, lists of individuals in government, education, business, industry, and the arts--from the local to the national level--were drawn upon to serve as respondents. The survey employed a Delphi-like procedure to acquire the opinions of respondents with regard to the institutional characteristics to be sought for the developing university. The first of two mailings elicited opinions on general areas of concern; the second focused on more specific topics of immediate interest to the planning staff of the institution.

The first mailing was directed to 1,185 individuals or key positions held by individuals. The respondents constituted or represented 33 groups whose opinions were judged important. Their responses to the broad, open-ended questions of the first questionnaire were used to construct the second questionnaire instrument. The second questionnaire was mailed to a revised list containing 1,205 names. The 547 usuable responses received to the second questionnaire constitute the basic data used to prepare the major portion of this report.

Information about the efficacy of Delphi procedures which was received after the first mailing led to the modification of the original design for the study. It was determined that a third questionnaire would not be required; additional time was allowed for responses to be made to the second questionnaire.

The contents of this document may serve as reference materials for those situations where options for institutional development are being considered and where discussants might benefit from access to the self-reported opinions of the various respondent groups. No pretense is made that all relevant opinions or topics have been solicited. However, many if not most of the fundamental issues which will arise during the planning stages of establishing an educational institution have been incorporated in items included in the second questionnaire instrument. Therefore, this document may prove useful to those engaged in such deliberations.

Design of the Survey

The purpose of the survey was to acquire the broadest possible exposure to the views of persons who, because of their geographical proximity, vocational responsibility, personal interest, or professional understanding, might provide insights of value to the planning staff for Governors State University. At the time this study was being planned, a similar investigation undertaken by a college of a state university during the preceding year was nearing completion. The Delphi Technique* had been employed in that survey to seek consensus with regard to purposes the college should seek to meet. The apparent success of that survey seemed to justify use of the same technique to initiate the Governors State University needs assessment survey. Therefore, the first tentative design commitment for this survey was to employ the Delphi method.

The second tentative commitment called for lists to be assembled containing approximately 1,000 respondents to be drawn from local, state and national, and academic area sources. Respondents, in terms of their interests, were to roughly correspond to the three "colleges" first contemplated as components for Governors State University.

Finally, it seemed likely that three questionnaires should be planned. The first was to seek diversity of opinion while the latter two were to seek the convergence or coming-together of opinions of the respondents to the first questionnaire on important planning issues. The last questionnaire was also intended to seek elaboration of reasons of respondents for non-conformity with the most popular opinions expressed. The end result sought was both an expression of consensus and an awareness of important reasons for differences of opinion as expressed by the various respondent groups.

Shortly after the start of the study, it became necessary to begin modifying the basic design plans of the survey. It soon became evident that the lists of potential respondents would be more difficult to assemble than anticipated. Reasons for this were (1) the increasing breadth of the planning effort undertaken by the staff being assembled by the president of Governors State University, (2) the non-availability of junior college-related lists

---

*A method of assessing group opinion through responses to a series of successive questionnaires by individuals who never meet face-to-face.

resulting from the rapid growth of those institutions with accompanying increases in staff and staff roles, and (3) lists were being sought at a time of year (late summer) when updated lists were still being assembled. As a result, adjustments were made which involved assembling additional and more complex lists.

After the first mailing had been prepared and distributed, it became evident that the initial interpretation concerning the utility of a pure Delphi approach to the survey was probably not the best way to proceed. This conclusion originated from the examination of responses to the first mailing and from a newly available statement about outcomes of the model survey which had been conducted by the other state university. This statement, which contained an updated description of the survey model, suggested that the planned third mailing might not provide sufficient elaboration to justify the expenditures involved in its conduct. Responses to the first Governors State University mailing also provided tentative confirmation that a third mailing might not be useful. Therefore, a second major design revision was made which called for only two mailings but with more broadly derived lists than originally anticipated.

Thus, the survey design which was finally implemented called for a modified Delphi approach to the survey with two mailings to be made. In order to increase the coverage of the distribution over groups of respondents not previously considered when the distribution outlines were first prepared, an increased number of smaller lists were assembled. A goal of no less than 1,000 names was established when final lists were assembled.

The mailings were to be prepared by Educational Testing Service. Inasmuch as Governors State University did not yet possess its own stationery, Educational Testing Service was to imprint on the mailings the name and current address of the university. Responses were to be received by Governors State University and subsequently transmitted to Educational Testing Service.

INSTRUMENTATION

The first survey instrument prepared, "Governors State University Delphi Questionnaire 'A'," occupied one side of a single page. It was kept as brief as possible so that it would not discourage the recipients from responding and would also permit them to diverge in their responses as much as they might wish. The response section of the document was as follows:

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY SHOULD BE:

1. RESPONSIVE TO_____
2. BUILT FOR: (a)_____
   (b)_____
3. ORGANIZED TO: (a)_____
   (b)_____
4. OPEN TO: (a)_____
   (b)_____
5. SELECTIVE IN: _____
6. DEMONSTRATIVE OF:
   (a) _____
   (b)_____

The full instrument is included in Appendix A together with a copy of the cover letter which accompanied it. Each recipient of Questionnaire "A" also received an addressed, stamped envelope in which to return his response.

The second instrument "Questionnaire 'B'", was prepared by first studying the responses to Questionnaire "A" and then employing them to guide the writing and assembly of the new instrument. This is to say that the second questionnaire was prepared directly from the responses to the first. It contained 50 items (one was inadvertently duplicated during assembly to give the appearance of 51) in a format calling for selection of one of five priority assignments to each item. Questionnaire "B" was a four-page instrument with a section of the last page reserved for respondents to request a copy of the summary of the total responses as a "reward" for their contribution to the study. A cover letter was again included in the second mailing with a pre-addressed, stamped envelope.

Appendix B consists of Questionnaire "B" and its accompanying cover letter. Additional information about the preparation, distribution, and return of these instruments is included in later sections of this document.

THE POPULATION OF RESPONDENTS

At no time during the conduct of this survey was it possible to establish a single listing of individuals to whom the Delphi-like instrumentation might be directed. Furthermore, on only a few occasions was it possible to specify a smaller subgroup whose members could be fully identified. Therefore, a wide variety of sources for lists and individual names was drawn upon. The compilation of lists and individual names continued through late summer and early fall and, was concluded shortly before the first mailing on October 27, 1969. At that time 965 names had been clearly identified as suitable for receipt of direct mailings. Of these names, 58 had been identified as those to whom multiple mailings could be directed together with instructions for their distribution to groups of individuals for whom there was no other convenient method of access.

At the time of the first mailing, a total of 36 subgroups had been identified for inclusion in the survey. Furthermore, because identification of student respondents and certain classifications of junior college personnel employed in probable feeder institutions for Governors State University had not provided sufficient names for direct mailings for those categories, packets of instruments were mailed to 58 junior college presidents for distribution to students and others whom they could more readily identify. Thus, the total initial mailing of Questionnaire "A" was directed to a target population of 1,185 individuals.

Three hundred fifteen usable Questionnaire "A's" were returned in time to be useful in the preparation of Questionnaire "B". In addition, another 45 unusable questionnaires were returned. Of these, 24 were returned too late to be used, 8 were returned by the postal department as undeliverable, and various other reasons such as respondents no longer being with the organization or institution indentified, death, refusals, etc., accounted for the remaining number.

Responses on Questionnaire "A" were subsequently studied by personnel at Educational Testing Service to determine the content of Questionnaire "B". An impression acquired during the study of the responses led to a review of documents describing the development of the Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI), an instrument published and distributed for research purposes by Educational Testing Service. Development work on the IFI began in 1967. Financial support was provided by the Kettering Foundation; Earl McGrath

of Teachers College, Columbia University, collaborated in its development. The instrument was of special interest because respondents to the open-ended items of Questionnaire "A" very often seemed to emphasize concepts considered in the development and initial analysis of the IFI. As a matter of fact, when responses had been screened and tallied, almost all were found to relate closely to one or more of eleven "IFI" variables identified by a factor analytic study of the contents of the IFI. Therefore, because of the very close relationship seen to exist between Questionnaire "A" responses and the "IFI variables", a decision was made to select items for Questionnaire "B" by first grouping Questionnaire "A" responses into sets most nearly resembling the eleven "IFI variables". The contents of those groupings were then reanalyzed before the final instrument was developed.*

The final assembly of Questionnaire "B" was made by including items judged to summarize the viewpoints taken by respondents to Questionnaire "A". Most items were prepared directly from the statements of one or more of those respondents. However, several items were prepared by using parts of descriptions of IFI variables as developed by Peterson and others. The total group of 50 items was then randomly assigned throughout the instrument.

The questionnaire was mailed, together with its cover letter, to a revised list of respondents. Included in the list were respondents to the first instrument, non-respondents to the first instrument, and names of persons acquired after the assembly of the first mailing list. Some names which had been on the first mailing list were deleted when the second was assembled.

It is the respondents to Questionnaire "B" who are being considered when data analysis is discussed in the following section. Questionnaire "B" was mailed to 1,205 individuals or offices. (Sometimes, to contact student leaders or others whose views were thought important, one individual in a position of responsibility was requested to distribute the instrument to others.) However individual respondents were still provided with a pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which to privately return their response.

By geographical location, 415 instruments were mailed to persons or offices within the local geographical area from which Governors State University

---

*For a description of the development of the Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI), see Richard E. Peterson, An Overview of the Development of the Institutional Functioning Inventory (Princeton, N.J.: ETS), 10+ pp.

students were likely to commute; another 514 were mailed to other locations within the State of Illinois; and 276 were mailed out of state. The number of responses which arrived in time for analysis from each of those three categories was 169, 247 and 131, respectively, with a combined response rate of 45.4 percent within the useful time limits. (In addition, there were 4 duplicate responses, 6 unusable responses, 6 returned by the postal service as undeliverable, and 25 returned too late for inclusion.)

Appendix C consists of a list of percents of responses to the mailing of Questionnaire "B" arranged by source of name of office. The following table lists the percents of responses by grouped categories of respondents. The names of these (sort group) categories were assigned in order to at least partially describe their possible contributory roles to the functioning of Governors State University and to the establishment of its purposes. The groups are not mutually exclusive. In some instances they are almost identical to a group recorded in Appendix C; however, the amount of overlap between the roles of persons in any two groups will tend not to exceed ten percent.

PERCENTS OF RESPONSES BY SORT GROUP CATEGORIES

Sort Groups	Mailed	Received	
		Number	Percent
I External Community Leadership	187	71	38.0
II Academic Executive Leadership	245	114	46.5
III Academic Operation Management	241	125	51.9
IV Faculty	128	63	49.2
V College Admissions	57	25	43.9
VI Public Education	70	37	52.9
VII External Associations (Education and Certification)	156	60	38.5
VIII Students	65	32	49.2
Blank Unclassified	56	20	35.7
Total	1,205	547	45.4

Since an 18 to 22 percent return is generally considered the expected, and acceptable, return for mail surveys (without incentives) conducted in

marketing research,* the 45.4 percent return of Questionnaire "B" may be judged to be an adequate response. The population for this survey is considered to be the 547 persons who responded in time so that their responses could be included in the data analysis. This group can be described as those persons who were concerned enough to return their questionnaires and who found the format and contents of Questionnaire "B" compatible with their desires to respond. No attempt is made to generalize the results to the larger group of persons who actually received questionnaires.

*Based on information obtained in a telephone conversation with a representative of the Direct Mail Advertising Association, Inc., New York, New York.

The Analysis of Responses

The items of Questionnaire "B" were prepared taking into consideration that they might generally relate to the IFI variables mentioned in the preceding section; responses to the instrument are, in this section, also grouped by the same categories. Tables I through XI were prepared by grouping items into sets, each of which seemed to relate to an IFI category. In numerous instances an item might logically have been included in more than one set. However, it was placed in only that set in which it appeared to relate best for purposes of this survey.

Each of the tables includes both a record of the mean item responses and the ranking of the mean item response by the various respondent groups. Likert-type items were employed in the instrument and item weights of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were assigned to item response choices H, AA, A, BA, and L, respectively. For example, in Table III, it is shown that Items 2, 6, 9, 25, 28, 31, and 42 were included in the IFI Scale Category grouping labeled (HD) Human Diversity. The mean response of all groups to Item 2 was 1.9. The mean response of Group IV was the lowest of all groups and therefore was ranked 8; the mean response of Group V was highest and therefore ranked 1.

Might respondent groups have differed (between each other) in their responses across all items? If they did, their mean item responses <u>or</u> the ranks of their responses across all items might have differed from each other. The Friedman non-parametric analysis of variance for ranks, when applied to rank data should reveal such bias by groups in response. The Friedman analysis of variance was applied to both responses grouped by geographical area and to data associated with Sort Group Categories for all 50 items.

The analysis <u>did not</u> reveal biases associated with geographical distribution of respondents. However, when applied to ranks for Sort Groups, a highly significant value of chi-square (probability less than .01) was noted. The sum of ranks across items for the Sort Groups were:

Sort Groups	Summed Rank
I External Community Leadership	267
II Academic Executive Leadership	217
III Academic Operation Management	233
IV Faculty	208
V College Admissions	226
VI Public Education	183
VII External Associations (Education and Certification)	190
VIII Students	276

Inspection of the summed ranks suggests that Groups I and VIII may have employed less positive response categories for item responses than other groups in general. An exact test of this hypothesis would require the computation of the variance-covariance matrix which was not possible with the resources available for this study. The reader is, therefore, cautioned to consider that there is a real possibility such a negative bias existed in the responses of these groups. However, he is also cautioned to understand that such a systematic bias may be fortunate (for at least some sets of items) because identifying important differences in viewpoints was one of the purposes of the survey.*

May the responses of some Sort Groups have differed on one or more of the 11 tabled sets of items? This question was dealt with by performing the same non-parametric analysis of variance on item response ranks for the eight Sort Groups for each set of items. Significant chi-square values were obtained for Item Sets A (probability less than .01), D (probability less than .05) and G (probability less than .05). Group I respondents seemed to have employed lower response categories than other groups for Set A; Group VI seemed to have employed higher and Group VIII lower responses for Set D; Groups III and VIII seemed to have employed lower ratings than other groups for Set G.

*A special study of the responses of junior college personnel revealed that no differences between them and other groups could be identified through non-parametric statistical procedures. Therefore, separate summaries for junior college personnel are not provided in this document.

An illustration of how this information can perhaps best be discussed during planning follows:

1. Invite discussants to consider the items in Table I. Their attention may be further focused by suggesting that they ask themselves whether or not the five items relate to "freedom".

2. Ask them to note that the External Community Leadership Response Group (I) responded, on the average, less favorably than the other seven groups on Items 10, 27, 29, and 51 (all ranked 8), and lower than all but the group of "Students" to Item 26.

3. Ask them to reflect on the possibility that "external community leaders" may be less interested in "freedom-type" items than the other respondents.

Of course, it is absolutely necessary to understand that the validity of any conclusions they may draw has not been validated. If this understanding is properly established, a similar series of considerations might be initiated with regard to the deviations of groups which have been noted above for Item Sets D and G. Through such discussions, the value of responses to individual items and sets of items may be studied and understood for planning purposes.

Did respondents as a whole give similar average responses to each of the 11 sets of items? This question may be answered by considering the average responses for each item set.* The means for each item set were as follows:

*The reader must understand that, because the number of respondents for each response group differs, the standard errors of measurement associated with the different sets are unequal. A similar effect is produced by the fact that the numbers of items in sets are unequal.

With the exception of Item Set A, the responses to sets seem to have been, on the average, similar. Thus, with the exception of the set tentatively labeled "Freedom," which received a higher average ranking than the other sets, meaningful differences in responses may not be discernible.

The reader of this report and its users will perhaps not benefit from more complex statistical analyses of the data which has been assembled. Also, it is not likely that more complex statistical analyses would be justified. Instead, in the tables which follow may be sought perceptions of the views, as reported on Questionnaire "B", of persons whose opinions are of special interest during the planning interval. The 11 tables may be studied singly and in groups, keeping in mind that inferences drawn should be related only to the respondent population.

Item means for all respondents, as recorded at the bottoms of the 11 tables, may be very useful to users. For example, Items 6, 9, and 28 in Table III, while grouped within "Human Diversity", actually provide clues that respondents would prefer to have Governors State University maintain high academic standards for admission. Quota allotments for students (Item 9) received the lowest rating of the items in the set.

Similarly, emphasis on teaching undergraduates may be discernible in Table V. Also discernible in the tables are lesser emphasis for systems and cost criteria in Table VIII, emphasized favor for a teaching role for faculty in Table IX, general concern for innovation in Table X, and low emphasis for interscholastic competition in Table XI.

The user is encouraged to view the data summaries prepared as an assemblage of information to be referred to when planners wish to acquire the views of the respondent population to Questionnaire "B". Validity of the data summaries for puposes of planning cannot be established. However, the self-reported views of the 547 respondents may usually be judged more important than the views attributed to individuals or (even) reported by individuals.

Recommendations

The tables in this document provide access to information acquired from an opinion survey which included hundreds of respondents whose opinions might be thought important to planners of Governors State University. The statistical summaries of the responses have been prepared with the expectation that they would be used as reference material during the planning stages of the institution. Therefore, their use may be most beneficial when questions arise with regard to development options and when a formal summary of large numbers of individuals are to be sought. Questions identified in the previous pages may be included for consideration among many others which can be raised concerning the development of the university.

It is anticipated that the information presented in this report will be used in two general types of settings: (1) where uncertainty about an issue has been established and the summary opinions of many groups of persons are needed to resolve uncertainties, and (2) where persons who are less familiar with planning issues require reference material for their studies which will permit them to come to grips more rapidly with the planning issues involved. The varied opinions of the many groups represented here should prove of value in considering the many purposes for which an institution of higher learning is being planned.

TABLE I

Item Set A*

Item 10. *To assure freedom in the personal lives of all individuals in the campus community.*

Item 26. *To facilitate individualized movement of students through the curriculum.*

Item 27. *To assure academic freedom for faculty and students.*

Item 29. *To provide for freedom of student expression and to clarify and protect students' rights.*

Item 51. *To prepare an environment conducive to informal, comfortable, human relationships.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 10	26	27	29	51
I. External Community Leadership	8	7	8	8	8
II. Academic Executive Leadership	4	5	6	4	7
III. Academic Operation Management	3	4	3	3	6
IV. Faculty	2	3	1	2	2
V. College Admissions	5	6	7	6	4
VI. Public Education	7	1	4	7	1
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	6	2	5	5	5
VIII. Students	1	8	2	1	3
1. Immediate attendance area	3	3	3	3	2
2. Other Illinois locations	2	2	2	2	2
3. Out of state	1	1	1	1	2
Item Mean for all respondents	2.4	1.8	1.9	2.3	1.8

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (F) Freedom.

TABLE II

Item Set B*

Item 16. *To make available activities and opportunities for intellectual and aesthetic stimulation outside the classroom.*

Item 20. *To provide an architectural climate conducive to learning.*

Item 34. *To involve non-school agencies in the educational program of the university.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 16	20	34
I. External Community Leadership	8	8	5
II. Academic Executive Leadership	3	5	3
III. Academic Operation Management	5	4	6
IV. Faculty	2	1	4
V. College Admissions	4	3	7
VI. Public Education	6	6	2
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	7	2	1
VIII. Students	1	7	8
1. Immediate attendance area	3	3	1
2. Other Illinois locations	2	2	2
3. Out of state	1	1	3
Item Mean for all respondents	2.2	2.5	2.8

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (IAE) Intellectual-Aesthetic Extra-curriculum.

TABLE III

Item Set C*

Item 2. *To select a faculty which has diverse backgrounds and attitudes.*

Item 6. *To admit students on the basis of their interests and desires more than on the basis of their academic performance or aptitude.*

Item 9. *To allocate percents of enrollment for minority groups or groups having low socioeconomic status.*

Item 25. *To assure that the needs of superior or outstanding students are met.*

Item 28. *To select a student body which is representative of the various ages, races, and aptitudes in our society.*

Item 31. *To assure that independent, tutorial, and small class instruction will be available.*

Item 42. *To assure that work experience or specially assessed performances may be substituted for specific course requirements.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 2	6	9	25	28	31	42
I. External Community Leadership	6	8	6	6	5	7	4
II. Academic Executive Leadership	3	4	2	5	4	5	6
III. Academic Operation Management	5	7	3	4	6	3	3
IV. Faculty	8	3	4	8	7	2	5
V. College Admissions	1	5	7	1	3	8	8
VI. Public Education	2	2	5	7	2	4	2
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	4	6	1	2	1	6	1
VIII. Students	7	1	8	3	8	1	7
1. Immediate attendance area	3	2	3	2	3	3	1
2. Other Illinois locations	2	1	2	1	2	2	2
3. Out of state	1	3	1	3	1	1	3
Item Mean for all respondents	1.9	2.8	3.0	2.1	2.8	2.3	2.5

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (HD) Human Diversity.

TABLE IV

Item Set D*

Item 1. *To assure continuation of the liberal arts tradition in education.*

Item 18. *To produce educational programs pointed toward new and emerging career fields.*

Item 21. *To produce an institution which contributes to the solution of social problems.*

Item 40. *To provide instruction in human relations and good government for all students.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 1	18	21	40
I. External Community Leadership	3	3	7	1
II. Academic Executive Leadership	4	5	5	5
III. Academic Operation Management	7	7	3	6
IV. Faculty	8	4	2	4
V. College Admissions	2	6	6	7
VI. Public Education	1	2	1	2
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	5	1	4	3
VIII. Students	6	8	8	8
1. Immediate attendance area	1	2	3	1
2. Other Illinois locations	2	1	2	2
3. Out of state	3	3	1	3
Item Mean for all respondents	2.8	2.0	2.1	2.3

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (IS) Concern for Improvement of Society.

TABLE V

Item Set E*

Item 11. *To strongly emphasize undergraduate teaching and learning.*

Item 32. *To concentrate on the use of mass media and instructional technology.*

Item 39. *To strongly emphasize the development of graduate curricula and graduate learning.*

Item 48. *To provide opportunities for advanced level adult continuing education.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 11	32	39	48
I. External Community Leadership	7	7	6	2
II. Academic Executive Leadership	3	5	5	5
III. Academic Operation Management	4	1	8	7
IV. Faculty	1	2	7	4
V. College Admissions	6	6	1	1
VI. Public Education	2	3	2	6
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	5	4	4	3
VIII. Students	8	8	3	8
1. Immediate attendance area	3	3	1	1
2. Other Illinois locations	2	2	2	2
3. Out of state	1	1	3	3
Item Mean for all respondents	1.8	3.0	2.9	2.6

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (UL) Concern for Undergraduate Learning.

TABLE VI

Item Set F*

Item 4. *To involve the citizens of nearby communities in decision-making about university development.*

Item 44. *To encourage shared, decentralized decision-making about university programs.*

Item 50. *To assure individuals the opportunity to be represented in decision-making which affects them.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 4	44	50
I. External Community Leadership	7	8	8
II. Academic Executive Leadership	8	5	6
III. Academic Operation Management	5	4	3
IV. Faculty	6	1	2
V. College Admissions	1	7	7
VI. Public Education	4	6	5
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	2	3	4
VIII. Students	3	2	1
1. Immediate attendance area	1	3	3
2. Other Illinois locations	2	2	2
3. Out of state	3	1	1
Item Mean for all respondents	2.8	2.4	2.1

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (DG) Democratic Governance.

TABLE VII

Item Set G*

Item 3. *To provide work-study programs in urban and inner-city areas.*

Item 17. *To stimulate the local population and help it to be a part of the university community.*

Item 33. *To provide for the educational needs of the people of the State of Illinois.*

Item 38. *To provide educational and cultural opportunities for all adults in the surrounding area.*

Item 46. *To meet the paramount educational needs of junior college graduates who are baccalaureate bound.*

Item 47. *To provide strong technical programs to meet the needs of individuals.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 3	17	33	38	46	47
I. External Community Leadership	6	4	1	1	2	1
II. Academic Executive Leadership	4	5	4	5	1	3
III. Academic Operation Management	2	7	7	7	8	8
IV. Faculty	3	6	5	6	7	6
V. College Admissions	7	1	2	2	6	5
VI. Public Education	5	2	3	3	4	7
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	1	3	6	4	5	2
VIII. Students	8	8	8	8	3	4
1. Immediate attendance area	3	1	1	2	1	1
2. Other Illinois locations	2	3	2	1	2	2
3. Out of state	1	2	3	3	3	3
Item Mean for all respondents	2.2	2.7	2.2	2.7	2.1	2.8

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (MLN) Meeting Local Needs.

TABLE VIII

Item Set H*

Item 15. *To provide for continuous long-range planning for the total institution.*

Item 24. *To undertake systems development and analyses as guides for institutional development.*

Item 30. *To broadly apply cost criteria to curricular and instructional alternatives.*

Item 35. *To develop plans for curricular and instructional evaluation for all programs.*

Item 37. *To undertake institutional research by which to formulate and revise plans.*

Item 49. *To involve students in curricular and instructional evaluation.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 15	24	30	35	37	49
I. External Community Leadership	7	6	2	8	7	8
II. Academic Executive Leadership	3	2	3	4	4	6
III. Academic Operation Management	5	1	6	3	1	2
IV. Faculty	4	5	8	5	3	4
V. College Admissions	2	3	5	6	2	7
VI. Public Education	1	4	1	2	6	3
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	6	7	7	1	5	5
VIII. Students	8	8	4	7	8	1
1. Immediate attendance area	3	2	3	3	3	3
2. Other Illinois locations	2	3	1	2	2	2
3. Out of state	1	1	2	1	1	1
Item Mean for all Respondents	1.6	2.7	2.9	1.9	2.3	2.4

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (SP) Self-Study and Planning.

TABLE IX

Item Set I*

Item 5. *To assure that teaching will be the most respected role for a faculty member.*

Item 7. *To support the faculty in its efforts to undertake research aimed at extending human knowledge.*

Item 19. *To stress community service as a defined part of faculty commitment and load.*

Item 36. *To recruit and reward faculty members who are highly proficient at research and scholarship.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 5	7	19	36
I. External Community Leadership	4	2	3	2
II. Academic Executive Leadership	3	6	4	8
III. Academic Operation Management	7	4	1	6
IV. Faculty	6	1	2	3
V. College Admissions	5	7	7	5
VI. Public Education	2	5	6	7
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	1	3	5	4
VIII. Students	8	8	8	1
1. Immediate attendance area	2	2	2	3
2. Other Illinois locations	1	3	3	2
3. Out of state	3	1	1	1
Item Mean for all respondents	1.8	2.8	2.8	3.1

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (AK) Concern for Advancing Knowledge.

TABLE X

Item Set J*

Item 8. *To assure receptivity to change by building in automatic change mechanisms in all curricular, instructional, and institutional systems.*

Item 12. *To be receptive to and to encourage experimentation with new ideas for educational practice at all levels.*

Item 14. *To encourage innovation at all stages of institutional planning and development.*

Item 45. *To model Governors State University in the established patterns of the more highly successful contemporary senior colleges.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 8	12	14	45
I. External Community Leadership	8	8	8	1
II. Academic Executive Leadership	4	5	3	6
III. Academic Operation Management	1	3	1	8
IV. Faculty	5	1	2	7
V. College Admissions	6	6	4	4
VI. Public Education	2	4	6	3
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	3	2	5	5
VIII. Students	7	7	7	2
1. Immediate attendance area	3	3	3	1
2. Other Illinois locations	2	2	2	2
3. Out of state	1	1	1	3
Item Mean for all respondents	1.9	1.6	1.8	3.7

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (CI) Concern for Innovation.

TABLE XI

Item Set K*

Item 13. *To develop strong programs of interscholastic participation in forensics, athletics, etc.*

Item 22. *To encourage loyalty to the university, its faculty, and administration.*

Item 23. *To seek commitment of faculty and administrators to established objectives.*

Item 43. *To encourage open and honest communication among faculty and administrators.*

Ranks of Mean Item Responses by Response Groups, and Item Means

RESPONSE GROUP	*ITEM* 13	22	23	43
I. External Community Leadership	2	1	7	7
II. Academic Executive Leadership	4	3	2	3
III. Academic Operation Management	6	8	5	6
IV. Faculty	8	6	6	4
V. College Admissions	5	2	1	1
VI. Public Education	3	4	3	5
VII. External Associations (Education and Certification)	7	5	4	2
VIII. Students	1	7	8	8
1. Immediate attendance area	1	1	3	3
2. Other Illinois locations	2	2	1	2
3. Out of state	3	3	2	1
Item Mean for all respondents	3.5	2.8	2.1	1.6

* These items are similar, but not identical, to items included in the IFI scale category which was tentatively labeled: (IE) Institutional Esprit.

TABLE XII

Rank Order and Means of Items on Questionnaire "B"

Rank Order	*Item Number*	*Mean Score*	*Rank Order*	*Item Number*	*Mean Score*
2	12	1.6	27	10	2.4
2	15	1.6	27	44	2.4
2	43	1.6	27	49	2.4
6	5	1.8	29.5	20	2.5
6	11	1.8	29.5	42	2.5
6	14	1.8	31	48	2.6
6	26	1.8	33	17	2.7
6	51	1.8	33	24	2.7
10.5	2	1.9	33	38	2.7
10.5	8	1.9	39	1	2.8
10.5	27	1.9	39	4	2.8
10.5	35	1.9	39	6	2.8
13	18	2.0	39	7	2.8
16	21	2.1	39	19	2.8
16	23	2.1	39	22	2.8
16	25	2.1	39	28	2.8
16	46	2.1	39	34	2.8
16	50	2.1	39	47	2.8
20	3	2.2	44.5	30	2.9
20	16	2.2	44.5	39	2.9
20	33	2.2	46.5	9	3.0
23.5	29	2.3	46.5	32	3.0
23.5	31	2.3	48	36	3.1
23.5	37	2.3	49	13	3.5
23.5	40	2.3	50	45	3.7

Note: Where items are tied for ranks, the rank assigned to each item is the median rank of the total number of tied items.

APPENDIX A:

QUESTIONNAIRE "A" AND ACCOMPANYING
COVER LETTER FOR THE FIRST
GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
P. O. Box 316
Park Forest, Illinois 60466

October 27, 1969

Dear Friend:

Plans for a new type of university were launched on July 17th, 1969 when Governor Ogilvie signed Governors State University into existence. The university, which will be located in Park Forest, Illinois, is unique in that it will be a senior division university, offering only third and fourth-year and master's programs. It is specifically designed to serve community college transfer students who will be commuting from Chicago and neighboring communities.

Governors State University is also unique in that it is intended to be an innovative, future-oriented, and public service minded institution. Its instructional units will probably include liberal arts, applied and health sciences, business and public service, and education. Governors State University anticipates planning to meet the educational needs of students and society not only in the '70s but in future decades as well.

While we are still in our early developmental planning stages, we are seeking opinions on better ways to use our educational potential. We believe that planning an institution such as Governors State University should reflect the best thinking of socially concerned individuals from government, education, business, industry, and the arts--from the local to the national level.

The technique we will be using to gather opinions is called the Delphi Technique. It was developed in the early 1950s by Olaf Helmer and his colleagues at the Rand Corporation. The technique is based on the premise that it is possible to influence the direction of future trends by proper planning, based on informed, intuitive judgments. While individuals never meet face-to-face, their opinions are collated and refined in a series of successive questionnaires. Feedback on the opinions of others is provided, thus permitting individuals to change their minds on particular issues, if they wish.

The procedure is as follows:

1) A first questionnaire calls for a brief list of what are considered to be major goals or recommended targets for action by the institution.

2) On a second mailing each individual receives a copy of a collated list of responses and is asked to rate each item by its importance and probability of success.

3) Later, a third and final mailing may report on the consensus of opinion, if any, on the items rated. Individuals may then be asked to either revise their opinions or to specify reasons for remaining outside the consensus.

The Delphi Technique, which has been used extensively to predict what will happen in the scientific, political, and technological areas, is now being increasingly used in education to predict what should happen. Even when group consensus cannot be reached, important issues can be clarified.

Your participation will be sincerely appreciated. Names will not be used in published tabulations and all participants will receive reports of the final results. Approximately ten minutes in each of the three above steps is needed. The first questionnaire is attached to this letter.

Won't you please help us plan this new university to serve the people of the State of Illinois?

Cordially,

William E. Engbretson

William Engbretson
President, Governors State University

Enclosure

The Delphi Technique, which has been used extensively to predict what will happen in the scientific, political, and technological areas, is now being increasingly used in education to predict what should happen. Even when group consensus cannot be reached, important issues can be clarified.

Your participation will be sincerely appreciated. Names will not be used in published tabulations and all participants will receive reports of the final results. Approximately ten minutes in each of the three above steps is needed. The first questionnaire is attached to this letter. In addition to completing the questionnaire, we would appreciate your forwarding the enclosed forms to those persons designated at your institution.

Won't you please help us plan this new university to serve the people of the State of Illinois?

Cordially,

William E. Engbretson

William Engbretson
President, Governors State University

Enclosure

(Alternate second page of a letter sent to those indipiduals to whom multiple mailings were directed)

*Name_____ Position_____

Address_____

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY DELPHI QUESTIONNAIRE "A"

The purpose of this questionnaire is to elicit suggested goals, purposes and developmental targets which, without the support your recommendations can provide, might not be considered for adoption during the critical planning phases which are immediately ahead. Please consider that Governors State will be built as a totally new senior institution on what is now farm land immediately adjacent to the southern edge of metropolitan Chicago. Therefore, suggestions with regard to any phase of institutional development are appropriate.

Please be as concise as you can about the targets you suggest we direct ourselves to. You may respond by completing the following expressions with phrases of your choosing.

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY SHOULD BE:

1. RESPONSIVE TO _____

2. BUILT FOR: (a) _____

(b) _____

3. ORGANIZED TO: (a) _____

(b) _____

4. OPEN TO: (a) _____

(b) _____

5. SELECTIVE IN _____

6. DEMONSTRATIVE OF: (a) _____

(b) _____

* All responses are confidential. The names of respondents will in no instance be reported. A prompt response would be appreciated.

APPENDIX B:

QUESTIONNAIRE "B" AND ACCOMPANYING
COVER LETTER FOR THE SECOND (FINAL)
GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
P. O. Box 316
Park Forest, Illinois 60466

January 2, 1970

Dear Friend:

This fall we addressed a letter to you and others in which you were told about the development of Governors State University, a senior college and graduate school to be located south of Chicago in Will County, Illinois. Many responses to that letter have been received and are greatly appreciated.

A new Delphi-oriented instrument has been developed on the basis of the first several hundred responses. The instrument contains brief summaries of goals suggested for Governors State University. While statements do not appear exactly as made by respondents, an effort has been made to include the intention or content of each statement as originally made. The purpose of this new instrument is to seek opinions on the relative priorities to be assigned to the assembled goals.

The instrument, enclosed with this letter, calls for your selection of one of five priority levels for each item: (H) highest, (AA) above average, (A) average, (BA) below average, and (L) lowest. Since most, if not all, of the listed goals are of considerable contemporary importance, it is essential that you discriminate between them. Your responses should cover the complete range of the scale--from highest to lowest. Please feel free to change any of your opinions after completing the instrument.

Since we are faced with an early deadline for the beginning of architectural planning, we urgently request that your response be forwarded as promptly as possible. We appreciate your cooperation and would like to thank you again for your assistance in planning Governors State University. We will be pleased to send you a summary of the total response to this questionnaire, if you wish. A space for this request has been provided at the close of the instrument. Please make any appropriate corrections in title or mailing address.

Cordially,

William E. Engbretson

William E. Engbretson
President, Governors State University

Enclosure

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY NEEDS SURVEY

QUESTIONNAIRE "B" - PRIORITY SURVEY

On the right side of each item below CIRCLE the one symbol that most closely approximates the level of priority which in your opinion should be assigned to each of the listed goals.

Circle: H . . . . . for highest priority
Circle: AA . . . . . for above average priority
Circle: A . . . . . for average priority
Circle: BA . . . . . for below average priority
Circle: L . . . . . for lowest priority

Remember to use ratings on the lower end of the scale--preferably as often as those on the higher end.

A GOAL OF GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY SHOULD BE . . . .

1. to assure continuation of the liberal arts tradition in education. H AA A BA L

2. to select a faculty which has diverse backgrounds and attitudes. H AA A BA L

3. to provide work-study programs in urban and inner city areas. H AA A BA L

4. to involve the citizens of nearby communities in decision-making about university development. H AA A BA L

5. to assure that teaching will be the most respected role for a faculty member. H AA A BA L

6. to admit students on the basis of their interests and desires more than on the basis of their academic performance or aptitude. H AA A BA L

7. to support the faculty in its efforts to undertake research aimed at extending human knowledge. H AA A BA L

8. to assure receptivity to change by building in automatic change mechanisms in all curricular, instructional, and institutional systems. H AA A BA L

9. to allocate percents of enrollment for minority groups or groups having low socioeconomic status. H AA A BA L

10. to assure freedom in the personal lives of all individuals in the campus community.	H	AA	A	BA	L
11. to strongly emphasize undergraduate teaching and learning.	H	AA	A	BA	L
12. to be receptive to and to encourage experimentation with new ideas for educational practice at all levels.	H	AA	A	BA	L
13. to develop strong programs of interscholastic participation in forensics, athletics, etc.	H	AA	A	BA	L
14. to encourage innovation at all stages of institutional planning and development.	H	AA	A	BA	L
15. to provide for continuous long-range planning for the total institution.	H	AA	A	BA	L
16. to make available activities and opportunities for intellectual and aesthetic stimulation outside the classroom.	H	AA	A	BA	L
17. to stimulate the local population and help it be a part of the university community.	H	AA	A	BA	L
18. to produce educational programs pointed toward new and emerging career fields.	H	AA	A	BA	L
19. to stress community service as a defined part of faculty commitment and load.	H	AA	A	BA	L
20. to provide an architectural climate conducive to learning.	H	AA	A	BA	L
21. to produce an institution which contributes to the solution of social problems.	H	AA	A	BA	L
22. to encourage loyalty to the university, its faculty, and administration.	H	AA	A	BA	L
23. to seek commitment of faculty and administrators to established objectives.	H	AA	A	BA	L
24. to undertake systems development and analyses as guides for institutional development.	H	AA	A	BA	L
25. to assure that the needs of superior or outstanding students are met.	H	AA	A	BA	L
26. to facilitate individualized movement of students through the curriculum.	H	AA	A	BA	L

27.	to assure academic freedom for faculty and students.	H	AA	A	BA	L
28.	to select a student body which is representative of the various ages, races, and aptitudes in our society.	H	AA	A	BA	L
29.	to provide for freedom of student expression and to clarify and protect students' rights.	H	AA	A	BA	L
30.	to broadly apply cost criteria to curricular and instructional alternatives.	H	AA	A	BA	L
31.	to assure that independent, tutorial, and small class instruction will be available.	H	AA	A	BA	L
32.	to concentrate on the use of mass media and instructional technology.	H	AA	A	BA	L
33.	to provide for the educational needs of the people of the State of Illinois.	H	AA	A	BA	L
34.	to involve non-school agencies in the educational program of the university.	H	AA	A	BA	L
35.	to develop plans for curricular and instructional evaluation for all programs.	H	AA	A	BA	L
36.	to recruit and reward faculty members who are highly proficient at research and scholarship.	H	AA	A	BA	L
37.	to undertake institutional research by which to formulate and revise plans.	H	AA	A	BA	L
38.	to provide educational and cultural opportunities for all adults in the surrounding area.	H	AA	A	BA	L
39.	to strongly emphasize the development of graduate curricula and graduate learning.	H	AA	A	BA	L
40.	to provide instruction in human relations and good government for all students.	H	AA	A	BA	L
41.	to develop plans for curricular and instructional evaluation for all programs.	H	AA	A	BA	L
42.	to assure that work experience or specially assessed performances may be substituted for specific course requirements.	H	AA	A	BA	L
43.	to encourage open and honest communication among faculty and administrators.	H	AA	A	BA	L

44. to encourage shared, decentralized decision-making about university programs.	H	AA	A	BA	L
45. to model Governors State University in the established patterns of the more highly successful contemporary senior colleges.	H	AA	A	BA	L
46. to meet the paramount educational needs of junior college graduates who are baccalaureate bound.	H	AA	A	BA	L
47. to provide strong technical programs to meet the needs of individuals.	H	AA	A	BA	L
48. to provide opportunities for advanced level adult continuing education.	H	AA	A	BA	L
49. to involve students in curricular and instructional evaluation.	H	AA	A	BA	L
50. to assure individuals the opportunity to be represented in decision-making which affects them.	H	AA	A	BA	L
51. to prepare an environment conducive to informal, comfortable, human relationships.	H	AA	A	BA	L

☐ Yes, I would like to receive the summary of the total response to this instrument.

Name_____

Title or Position_____

Address_____

_____

Note: All responses are confidential. The names of respondents will in no instance be reported.

APPENDIX C:

PERCENTS OF RESPONSES TO THE MAILING
OF QUESTIONNAIRE "B" ARRANGED
BY SOURCE OR NAME OF OFFICE

TABLE XIII

Percents of Responses to the Mailing of Questionnaire "B"
Arranged by Source or Name of Office

Sources of Sort Groups	Total Mailed	Percent Used	Respondents	Non-Respondents
1. Invitational List for Governors State University	27	40.7	11	16
2. Citizens Committee on Senior Colleges	--	--	--	--
3. Opening Events Program	86	37.2	32	54
4. List: Unitarian Sponsored Human Relations Councils	46	45.7	21	25
5. HIER Education Directory	40	30.0	12	28
6. List: Participants, AAHE 1969 National Conference	16	31.2	5	11
7. Illinois ASCD Directory of Members	43	72.1	31	12
8. American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business	49	38.8	19	30
9. AACTE (National)	132	59.1	78	54
10. AACTE (State)	27	48.1	13	14
11. ICAC: Admissions Counselors, Junior Colleges, State	17	35.3	6	11
12. ICAC: Admissions Counselors, National	18	44.4	8	10
13. ICAC: Special Organizations re Admissions	5	60.0	3	2
14. ICAC: State, Admissions Counselors	10	30.0	3	7
15. ICAC: High School Counselors re Admissions	42	50.0	21	21
16. Illinois State Organizations	81	44.4	36	45
17. Illinois State Boards	48	37.5	18	30
18. Nurse-Educators	--	--	--	--
19. Chicago City College: President, Deans, Directors	56	46.4	26	30
20. Chicago City College: President, Student, Dean of Students, Dean of Faculty or Instruction	31	35.5	11	20
21. Chicago City College: Faculty Members	38	26.3	10	28
22. Industry in Blue Island	11	27.3	3	8
23. Kankakee Area Industry	6	66.7	4	2
24. Clubs & Organizations: Chicago Heights	3	0.0	--	3
25. Joliet Area Service Clubs	5	40.0	2	3

TABLE XIII *(cont'd.)*

Sources of Sort Groups	Total Mailed	Percent Used	Respond-ents	Non-Respond-ents
26. List of Clubs & Organizations: Local	10	30.0	3	7
27. Organizations: Park Forest	9	44.4	4	5
28. Kankakee Clubs & Organizations	13	23.7	3	10
29. Clubs & Organizations: Blue Island	2	0.0	--	2
30. Students: Chicago	6	16.7	1	5
31. Village of Flossmoor Officials	2	50.0	1	1
32. Miscellaneous	16	50.0	8	8
33. Junior Colleges: Tiers 1, 2, 3 (5 categories)	80	57.5	46	34
34. Junior Colleges: State (5 categories)	99	50.5	50	49
35. Junior Colleges: Local, Independent, Parochial & Private Schools	67	34.3	23	44
36. Junior Colleges Withdrawn from First Mailing	--	--	--	--
37. Not on Original List	64	54.7	35	29
TOTAL:	1205	45.4	547	658

Duplications: 4

Unusable responses: 6

"Return to sender": 6

Too late for use: 25

Late from first mailing: 3

Did not mail to the 2nd time: 21